

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 11 are amended. No new matter is added by these amendments. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Dickerson in the August 11 telephone interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the telephone interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8 and 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,965,440 to Nakagiri et al. (hereinafter "Nakagiri") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,934,046 to Nishikawa et al. (hereinafter "Nishikawa"). Additionally, the Office Action rejects claims 9, 10, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagiri in view of Nishikawa, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0184805 to Kurokawa et al. (hereinafter "Kurokawa"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claims 1 and 11 each recite, *inter alia*, that the print job connection component includes information designated by a user as to whether or not an original print job corresponding to the respective one of the plurality jobs should be deleted from or retained in the memory when the jobs stored in the memory are selected and generation of the connected job is instructed. This feature is shown in Figs. 9(B) and 10 and described in the specification at, for example, page 24, line 18-page 25, line 9. Applicants respectfully submit that this feature allows the user more flexibility to the user with respect to composing the connected print job.

During the August 11 telephone interview, Examiner Dickerson suggested that Fig. 28 of Nakagiri shows a "Delete" button as an option to delete a job from combined jobs, thereby allegedly teaching the information designated by a user as to whether or not an original print

job corresponding to the respective one of the plurality jobs should be deleted from in the memory when the jobs stored in the memory are selected and generation of the connected job is instructed. However, as discussed during the telephone interview, Applicants respectfully submit that it is not the information included in the print job connection component as recited in claim 1, but merely an instruction using a graphical user interface to remove a job from the combined jobs. In addition, even if the Delete button were considered to correspond to this feature, such button does not provide an option for the user to indicate whether or not an original print job corresponding to the respective one of the plurality jobs should be deleted from or retained in the memory. Therefore, Nakagiri does not teach or suggest this feature.

Nishikawa discloses in Fig. 32 and at col. 25, lines 17-21 that, when the composed job is created, the spool file manager 304 deletes the jobs copied to the composed job structure from the job management list. Therefore, Nishikawa does not provide an option to the user as to whether the original print job should be deleted or maintained.

Thus, at least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Nakagiri and Nishikawa, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, claims 1 and 11 are patentable over the applied references.

Kurokawa does not overcome the deficiencies of Nakagiri and Nishikawa with respect to claims 1 and 11. Therefore, dependent claims 2-10 and 12-20 are allowable at least for their dependence on allowable base claims, as well as for the additional features they recite.

As such, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

James E. Golladay, II
Registration No. 58,182

JAO:KXH/mab

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: August 22, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--